BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
BANGALORE

Proceedings of the Pre-Bid Meeting for

"Design, Development, and Implementation of End-to-End E-Auction Management System with Real-Time Bidding Engine, Fraud Detection, Integrated Payment & Refund Management, and Tamper-Proof Audit Framework for Bangalore Development Authority (BDA)"

held on 10th April 2026 at 11.30 Hrs at EDP Cell, BDA Head Office, Bengaluru

Sub: *Design, Development, and Implementation of End-to-End E-Auction Management System with Real-Time Bidding Engine, Fraud Detection, Integrated Payment & Refund Management, and Tamper-Proof Audit Framework for Bangalore Development Authority (BDA).*

Ref : **Tender Reference No:** BDA/2026-27/SE0095

Date of Pre-Bid Meeting: 07-04-2026 at 11.30 Hrs

Venue: EDP Cell, BDA Head Office, 5th Main Road, Kumara Park West, T. Chowdaiah Road, Guttahalli, Bengaluru-560020

Pre-Bid queries received up to: 08-04-2026 at 17:30 Hrs (queries received via email after the pre-bid meeting have also been considered and addressed in these proceedings)

* * * * * * * * * *

Members of the Tender Evaluation Committee (TEC) Present

Sl.	Name	Designation	Position
1	Dr. Shantharajanna H R	Engineering Member, BDA	Chairman
2	Dr. A. Lokesha	Finance Member, BDA	Member
3	Sri Niranjan K M	Executive Engineer HPD-1, BDA	Member
4	Smt. Nandini P M	EDP Cell Head, SLAO-6, DSKL	Member

PROCEEDINGS

At the outset, the Chairperson, BDA, welcomed all members of the Tender Evaluation Committee (TEC) and the representatives of prospective bidders who had submitted pre-bid queries in response to the RFP published vide Tender Reference No. BDA/2026-27/SE0095 for the "Design, Development, and Implementation of End-to-End E-Auction Management System with Real-Time Bidding Engine, Fraud Detection, Integrated Payment & Refund Management, and Tamper-Proof Audit Framework for Bangalore Development Authority (BDA)."

Bidders Who Submitted Pre-Bid Queries / Attended the Meeting

Sl.	Bidder / Company Name	Representative	Mode
1	e-Procurement Technologies Ltd. (ETL)	Mr. Mouli	Google Meet/Email
2	Inventech Info Solutions	Mr. Vadiraj Karanam /Mr. Kempe Gowda	Google Meet/Email

Receipt No. 487122/2026/O/O THE EDP CELL (Computer No. 487122)

Generated from eOffice by DR. H R SHANTHARAJANNA, BDA-EM(HRS), ENGINEER MEMBER, BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY on 10/04/2026 06:23 PM

1.0 General Observations and Clarifications by BDA

The Committee deliberated on the eligibility conditions and the technical evaluation criteria as specified in the RFP and resolved that all eligibility conditions and technical evaluation criteria shall remain as published without any modification, except for the relaxation noted below regarding Clause 1.5, Sl. No. 9 (IT Manpower Strength – Karnataka-based professionals). The eligibility criteria have been carefully designed to ensure that only competent, experienced and well-equipped Service Providers participate in this project, which involves developing a mission-critical real-time E-Auction system handling public asset disposal and significant government revenue. Any dilution of these criteria would compromise the quality and security of the project.

Regarding Clause 1.5, Sl. No. 9 – IT Manpower Strength: The Committee, after considering the representations received from multiple prospective bidders, has decided to relax the requirement that "at least 25 of these professionals shall be based in Karnataka." The revised position is as follows: The requirement of 25 IT professionals mandatorily based in Karnataka is hereby relaxed. However, the Bidder shall have a minimum of 50 (fifty) full-time IT professionals on its direct payroll as originally specified. Furthermore, the Service Provider shall unconditionally ensure that whenever BDA requires the physical presence of developers, technical leads, project managers, or any other IT professionals at BDA premises — whether for on-site development, deployment, training, UAT, go-live support, live auction monitoring, troubleshooting, or any other project-related activity — such personnel shall be made available at BDA's premises within 24 hours of intimation, at the Service Provider's cost, for the entire duration required by BDA. The mandatory deputation of 2 full-time software professionals at BDA premises as per Clause 1.6(iii) remains unchanged and non-negotiable.

The E-Auction Management System is a real-time, transaction-intensive platform that must operate with zero tolerance for downtime during live auctions. The system handles public financial transactions, requires legally defensible audit trails, and must comply with multiple Indian regulations including the IT Act 2000, DPDP Act 2023, and Indian Evidence Act 1872.

The Financial Proposal shall be a comprehensive, all-inclusive lump-sum project cost. No separate or additional claims shall be entertained.

BDA shall arrange and bear the cost of all third-party API subscriptions and gateway contracts. The Service Provider shall bear all technical integration costs within the lump-sum Financial Proposal.

BDA shall provide the official domain name and production SSL certificate. The system shall be deployed on Government of Karnataka SDC or BDA-specified infrastructure.

All training shall be conducted physically (in-person) at BDA premises. A minimum of two rounds mandatory — during UAT and before go-live.

STQC certification is conditional, not an eligibility criterion. VAPT before go-live and annually during warranty is mandatory at the Service Provider's cost.

All software licenses shall be perpetual and transferred to BDA upon project completion. Open-source technologies are encouraged.

The Committee has noted certain drafting errors in the Service Contract (Draft) annexed to the RFP, including references to "Grievance Management Portal" instead of "E-Auction Management System," the performance security amount of Rs. 1,50,000 instead of 5% of bid value, the agreement term of 90 days instead of implementation + warranty period, and the technology restriction to "Java and MySQL" instead of technology-agnostic terms. These errors are acknowledged as inadvertent template carry-overs and shall be corrected at the time of execution of the Service Contract. The substantive terms of the RFP (Sections 1–6) shall prevail over the draft Service Contract in case of any inconsistency.

The General Conditions of Contract, Special Conditions, Force Majeure, Termination, Dispute Settlement and all other contractual clauses as published in the RFP are standard government contract terms and shall remain as published without modification.

These pre-bid meeting proceedings and the clarifications contained herein shall form an integral part of the RFP and the resultant Contract.

Bidders are requested to note the clarifications provided herein and prepare their proposals accordingly.

Receipt No. 487122/2026/O/O THE EDP CELL (Computer No. 487122)

Generated from eOffice by DR. H R SHANTHARAJANNA, BDA-EM(HRS), ENGINEER MEMBER, BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY on 10/04/2026 06:23 PM

2.0 QUERY-WISE CLARIFICATIONS

Sl.	Bidder(s)	RFP Ref.	Query / Clarification Sought	BDA Response
A. ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA & MANPOWER				
A1	ETL / Inventech	Sec 1.5, Pg 6, Cl. 9	The clause mandating 25 IT professionals within Karnataka may restrict participation to Karnataka-based bidders, limiting fair competition. Request BDA to relax this clause to allow broader participation from experienced bidders across India.	The Committee has considered the representations and decided to relax this requirement in the interest of broader participation and competitive outcome for BDA. Revised Position: The requirement that "at least 25 of these professionals shall be based in Karnataka" is hereby relaxed. The Bidder shall continue to have a minimum of 50 full-time IT professionals on its direct payroll as originally specified. However, the Service Provider shall unconditionally ensure: (a) Whenever BDA requires physical presence of developers, technical leads, project managers, or any IT professionals at BDA premises — for on-site development, deployment, training, UAT, go-live, live auction monitoring, troubleshooting, or any project activity — such personnel shall be available at BDA premises within 24 hours of intimation, at the Service Provider's cost, for the entire duration required by BDA. (b) Mandatory deputation of 2 full-time professionals at BDA premises per Clause 1.6(iii) remains unchanged. At least one shall be a Senior Developer / Technical Lead with minimum 5 years experience. (c) All training sessions shall be conducted physically at BDA premises. (d) During live auctions, dedicated support personnel shall be available on-call/on-site as required. (e) Failure to make personnel available within 24 hours upon BDA's request shall be treated as contractual breach and attract penalties. All other eligibility criteria under Section 1.5 remain as published.
A2	ETL	General Query	Recommend inclusion of STQC certification as eligibility criterion.	Not accepted. STQC is product-level certification, not organisational capability. Including it as eligibility would unreasonably restrict competition. RFP already includes ISO 9001, ISO 27001, CMMI Level 3+, mandatory VAPT, OWASP Top 10, and conditional STQC post-development. No change.
B. FINANCIAL PROPOSAL, COMMERCIAL & LICENSES				
B1	ETL	Appendix IV, Pg 55, Sl. 4	"Total Cost – Per Certificate" — is this STQC certificate cost or any other certificate?	Refers to total project cost certified by the bidder's Statutory Auditor / CA. Not STQC. Bidder quotes all-inclusive lump-sum, certified by CA on firm's letterhead. STQC cost, if mandated, borne by Service Provider.
B2	ETL	Appendix IV & Cl. 1.6(iii)	On deputation of 2 full-time professionals at BDA, do we include both costs in Appendix IV?	Yes. All-inclusive lump-sum: design, development, testing, deployment, on-site deputation, training, data migration, integrations, VAPT, warranty, travel and accommodation. No separate reimbursement.
B3	ETL	General Query	After expiry of agreement, who bears the license cost to run the application?	During agreement: Service Provider bears all license costs. Post-agreement: All IP vests with BDA. Perpetual licenses (not subscriptions) transferred to BDA. Open-source encouraged. BDA shall not bear recurring license costs for SP-introduced components.
C. SECURITY, COMPLIANCE & CERTIFICATION				

Receipt No. 487122/2026/O/O THE EDP CELL (Computer No. 487122)

Generated from eOffice by DR. H R SHANTHARAJANNA, BDA-EM(HRS), ENGINEER MEMBER, BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY on 10/04/2026 06:23 PM

C1	ETL	Sec 6.3.15 (C)(4), Pg 40	VAPT before go-live and annually for three years? Which agency? Who bears cost?	Pre-Go-Live VAPT: Mandatory. Annual during warranty (min 1 year): Mandatory. Post-warranty: per AMC terms. Agency: CERT-In empanelled auditor at SP's cost. BDA may engage own auditor at BDA's cost. All VAPT during implementation and warranty included in lump-sum.
C2	ETL	Sec 6.3.15 (C)(5), Pg 40	Elaborate on STQC certification requirement.	Conditional, not mandatory pre-go-live. BDA may mandate at any stage. If mandated, SP facilitates and bears cost. Pre-go-live VAPT mandatory regardless.
C3	ETL	Cl. 1.6(v), Pg 7	Elaborate on compliance with GoK IT policies, data protection, security guidelines.	Key regulations: IT Act 2000, DPDP Act 2023, Indian Evidence Act Section 65B, GoK IT Policy, KTPP Act, GoK Cyber Security Policy, OWASP Top 10, NIC Guidelines, GST Act, Indian Contract Act. List is indicative. SP independently ensures compliance.
C4	Inventech	Sec 1.2(f), 6.2 (Audit)	Immutability level? Section 65B compliance? Retention period? Exportability? Third-party audit?	Hash-chain (cryptographic chaining) mandatory. Blockchain desirable, not mandatory for Go-Live. Section 65B certificates: Yes, on demand. Retention: Min 7 years. Export: Yes (CSV/Excel/PDF). Third-party: CERT-In VAPT mandatory; additional at BDA's cost.
D. INFRASTRUCTURE, DOMAIN & APIs				
D1	ETL	General Query	Domain Name & SSL — purchased by BDA or Service Provider?	Domain: BDA provides under GoK infrastructure. SSL: BDA procures production certificate via NIC/GoK at BDA's cost. Dev/staging: SP uses own at own cost. SP handles technical configuration.
D2	ETL	General Query	Will BDA provide dedicated domain or do we create subdomain under our domain?	BDA provides dedicated domain. SP shall not host production under own domain. UAT and production use BDA domain. SP coordinates DNS with BDA IT/SDC team.
D3	ETL	General Query	Who arranges APIs (SMS, Aadhaar, etc.)? Who bears cost?	BDA arranges and contracts all APIs: Payment Gateway, SMS, Email, KYC/PAN, DSC, Aadhaar, Layout Info System, Bank Recon, NTP. BDA bears all API/gateway costs. SP bears all technical integration costs within lump-sum.
D4	Inventech	Sec 1.2(g), 6.2 (Integr.)	API docs for Layout System? DSC provider? Digital signing mandatory? Notification channels? API SLAs?	Layout: BDA provides API specs and access. DSC: BDA designates; architecture supports standard APIs (e-Sign, e-Mudhra). Configurable per master config. Notifications: Email mandatory; SMS optional; WhatsApp not in scope but architecture supports future channels. API SLAs: Defined during SRS.
D5	Inventech	Sec 1.2, 6.2 (Deploy.)	SDC, Cloud, or Hybrid? Infrastructure constraints? Auto-scaling? Uptime SLA?	GoK SDC or BDA infra. Cloud not envisaged. Specs during SRS via capacity planning. Auto-scaling: Architecture supports it. Uptime: 99.5%+ (Section 6.6.3(1)). Detailed SLA in Contract.
E. LIVE BIDDING ENGINE & AUCTION MANAGEMENT				
E1	Inventech	Sec 1.2(d), 6.2 (Bidding)	Peak concurrent bidders? TPS? Delta time per auction or global? Extension cap? Same-timestamp bids? NTP source? Latency tolerance?	Peak: 500 concurrent/auction (Section 6.6.1(1)). Stress: 250 bidders in last 10 sec. TPS: 100 bids/sec (Section 6.6.1(6)). Delta: Configurable per auction + global defaults. Extension cap configurable (Section 6.3.7(D)(3)). Same timestamp: Earliest prevails; if identical, random selection; in audit trail. NTP: NIC/ERTL, millisecond precision. Latency: ±1 sec max drift; display within 2 sec.

4

Receipt No. 487122/2026/O/O THE EDP CELL (Computer No. 487122)

Generated from eOffice by DR. H R SHANTHARAJANNA, BDA-EM(HRS), ENGINEER MEMBER, BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY on 10/04/2026 06:23 PM

E2	Inventech	Sec 1.2(j), 6.1(20)	Max items per batch? Parallel execution? Bulk upload? Group auctions?	Batch: 10/50/100+ properties, scalable. Parallel: 50+ concurrent auctions. Bulk: Excel template with row-level validation (Section 6.3.4(D)(4)). Groups: Yes, all bid types (Section 6.3.4(B)(1)).
E3	Inventech	Sec 1.2(e), 6.2 (Monitor.)	Force Close hierarchy? Conditions? Bidder notification? Rollback?	Initiator records reason; routes to approver; execution on approval (Section 6.3.9(3)). Conditions: fraud, technical failure, admin decision. Notification: Immediate email + SMS. Rollback: Not mandated; failover restores state (Section 6.3.7(E)). Cancelled auction may be re-created.
E4	Inventech	Sec 1.2(i), 6.1(21)	Scoring formula? Dynamic weights? Tie-breaking? Multiple evaluators? Conflict resolution?	Configurable Technical + Financial + Combined formula. Weights configurable per auction. Tie-breaking: earliest timestamp, then random. Multi-evaluator supported. Conflict: average, escalation, or mandatory justification (Section 6.3.6(4)).
F. FRAUD DETECTION & ANTI-COLLUSION				
F1	Inventech	Sec 1.2(h), 6.2 (Fraud)	Rule-based or ML? Actions on detection? Predefined rules? Same-IP handling? Real-time scoring?	Rule-based mandatory for Go-Live; ML Phase 2 (pipeline from Phase 1). Flag and alert; auto-suspension configurable; no auto-disqualification without review. No predefined rules; SP proposes, agreed during SRS. Same-IP: flag, not auto-block. Real-time rule alerts mandatory; scoring as Phase 2.
G. REGISTRATION, KYC & PAYMENT				
G1	Inventech	Sec 6.3.1	KYC provider? Aadhaar? Retry policy? Manual override?	BDA designates KYC provider; integration provider-agnostic. Aadhaar if required per Cl. 4.1(e). Retry: configurable retries; “Pending Verification” on failure. No manual override; PAN must be API-verified. All results logged.
G2	Inventech	Sec 1.2(g), 6.2 (Payment)	Which gateway? Multi-gateway failover? Offline payment? Refund SLA? Refund approval? Partial refund? Bank recon API?	BDA contracts gateway (Cl. 4.1(c)); integration gateway-agnostic. Multi-gateway desirable; architecture supports. Offline optional (Section 6.3.5(C)(3)). Refund SLA: 3 WD initiation, 7 WD completion, escalation 5 WD. Auto/Manual per config. Partial refund not in scope. Bank recon: BDA facilitates bank access.
H. MULTI-TENANCY & LEGAL FRAMEWORK				
H1	Inventech	Sec 1.2(l), 6.2	Data isolation? Custom branding? Shared or separate deployment? Tenant onboarding?	Strict tenant isolation (Section 6.6.7(2)); approach in SRS. Custom branding supported. Shared infra with logical isolation. Super Admin onboards. Multi-tenancy is future-ready; BDA is primary tenant for Go-Live. Source code is NOT distributed to other tenants — tenants use the shared deployed platform under BDA’s control.
H2	Inventech	Sec 1.2(m), 6.2	Dispute resolution workflow? Online grievance? Timeline? Final authority?	Formal dispute per Section 6.4.3 with unique ID. Online portal-based submission. Configurable SLA per type. Final: conciliation then arbitration in Bengaluru (Contract Clause 9). In-system via RBAC.
I. DATA MIGRATION, TRAINING & SUPPORT				
I1	Inventech	Sec 6.2(16)	Legacy data format/volume? Structured or manual? Data cleansing? Post-migration validation?	Structured (database) and semi-structured (Excel/PDF). Volume assessed during SRS. SP designs migration with BDA. Data quality assessment and de-duplication included. Post-migration: mandatory validation with rollback strategy and BDA sign-off (Section 6.7).

Receipt No. 487122/2026/O/O THE EDP CELL (Computer No. 487122)

Generated from eOffice by DR. H R SHANTHARAJANNA, BDA-EM(HRS), ENGINEER MEMBER, BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY on 10/04/2026 06:23 PM

I2	Inventech / ETL	Sec 1.2(n), 6.2(17,18)	Users to train? Training mode? L1/L2/L3 support? Penalty clauses?	Indicative: Admin (5–10), Ops (15–20), Evaluator (5–10), Bidders (group sessions). Physical at BDA premises, 2 rounds min. L1/L2/L3 with SLA: Critical 4 hrs, High 8 hrs. Penalties for downtime, data loss, security breach, SLA failure (Section 6.9(4)).
J. TIMELINE & EXTENSION				
J1	ETL	General Query	Request to extend bid submission deadline by 7–9 working days from 13.04.2026.	Noted. BDA shall consider and issue corrigendum if appropriate via e-Procurement portal. Bidders should prepare based on published timeline.
K. OBSERVATIONS NOTED BY BDA (Based on Expert Review of RFP & Draft Service Contract)				
K1	BDA (Expert Review)	Pg 56, 58 Service Contract	The draft Service Contract (introductory paragraph and project definition) refers to "Grievance Management Portal for BDA" instead of "E-Auction Management System."	Noted and acknowledged. This is an inadvertent template carry-over from a previously issued tender. The Service Contract shall be corrected to read "Design, Development, and Implementation of End-to-End E-Auction Management System" at the time of execution. The substantive terms of the RFP (Sections 1–6) shall prevail over the draft Service Contract in case of any inconsistency.
K2	BDA (Expert Review)	Pg 60 Cl. 3.1(a) Perform. Security	The draft Service Contract states Performance Security of Rs. 1,50,000, whereas Clause 2.18.1 of the RFP specifies 5% of the total bid value.	Noted and acknowledged. The figure of Rs. 1,50,000 in the draft Service Contract is an inadvertent carry-over. The correct Performance Security shall be 5% of the total bid value as stated in Clause 2.18.1 of the RFP. The Service Contract shall be corrected accordingly at the time of execution.
K3	BDA (Expert Review)	Pg 59 Cl. 2.1 Agreement Term	The draft Service Contract states the agreement term as 90 days, which contradicts the 1-year warranty period specified in Section 6.9 of the RFP.	Noted and acknowledged. The 90-day term in the draft Service Contract is a template carry-over and is insufficient. The Agreement Term shall be corrected to cover the complete implementation period plus the warranty period (minimum 12 months from Go-Live and final acceptance by BDA). The Service Contract shall be corrected at the time of execution.
K4	BDA (Expert Review)	Pg 61 Cl. 3.5(c) Other Obligations	The draft Service Contract restricts technology to "Java and MySQL only," whereas the RFP (Section 6) does not mandate any specific technology stack.	Noted and acknowledged. The "Java and MySQL" restriction in the draft Service Contract is a template carry-over and is inconsistent with the technology-agnostic approach of the RFP. This clause shall be corrected to read: "Use the technology stack as proposed by the Service Provider in the accepted Technical Proposal, with valid data security protection certificates/products." The Service Contract shall be corrected at the time of execution.
K5	BDA (Expert Review)	Pg 13, 18 (Cl. 2.5, 3.1)	The RFP uses the term "IT Consultancy" in Clauses 2.5 and 3.1 where it should refer to "Bidders."	Noted. The term "IT Consultancy" as used in Clauses 2.5 and 3.1 shall be read as "Bidders" for all purposes. This is an editorial inconsistency and does not alter the substantive meaning or obligations. No corrigendum is necessary; this clarification shall suffice.
K6	BDA (Expert Review)	Pg 57 Intellectual Property	The IP definition in the draft Service Contract is vague and may not fully align with Section 6.11(1) and 6.11(2) of the RFP.	The IP clause in the Service Contract shall be read in conjunction with Section 6.11 of the RFP, which unambiguously provides: (a) All intellectual property rights in the developed system shall vest with BDA upon final acceptance and payment (Section 6.11(1)); (b) Complete source code, database scripts, configuration files, and technical documentation shall be handed over (Section 6.11(2)). The Service Contract shall be tightened at the time of execution to align with Section 6.11 language.

Receipt No. 487122/2026/O/O THE EDP CELL (Computer No. 487122)

Generated from eOffice by DR. H R SHANTHARAJANNA, BDA-EM(HRS), ENGINEER MEMBER, BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY on 10/04/2026 06:23 PM

K7	BDA (Expert Review)	Pg 43 Multi-Tenancy	Multi-tenancy — does it mean that source code will be handed over to other departments as well? Will the product company lose in such a case?	Clarified. Multi-tenancy means other Government organisations use the same deployed platform under BDA's administrative control. Source code is NOT distributed to other tenants. Other departments access the system as users/tenants with their own data isolation, branding, and configuration, but the source code, infrastructure, and administrative control remain exclusively with BDA. The Service Provider's IP concerns are addressed through the handover to BDA (not to third parties).
K8	BDA (Expert Review)	General	Suggestion: Increase e-Auction experience requirement from 1 project to 2 projects (Section 1.5, Sl. 2).	Not accepted. Increasing the experience requirement would further restrict the bidding pool without proportionate benefit. One completed e-Auction project is sufficient to demonstrate capability. Other criteria (turnover, certifications, live demo with 25 marks, technical approach) adequately filter quality. The eligibility criteria remain as published.
K9	BDA (Expert Review)	General	Suggestion: Consortium or subcontracting restriction (Clause 1.6(ii)) limits the choice of bidders.	Not accepted. The restriction on consortium/subcontracting is standard for mission-critical government IT projects. Allowing consortium introduces accountability gaps for a real-time E-Auction system where a single entity must own end-to-end delivery, support, and warranty. The clause remains as published.
K10	BDA (Expert Review)	Sec 3.3, Pg 19–20	Suggestions to redistribute technical evaluation scoring: reduce e-Auction experience, remove Positive Net Worth marks, remove ISO 9001 marks, increase Key Personnel to 20, increase Live Demo to 30, raise live demo qualifying threshold to 75%.	Not accepted. The scoring matrix was carefully designed and balanced: Work Experience (25) + Financial Turnover (25) + Certifications (10) + Technical Docs & Manpower (15) + Live Demo (25) = 100. Any redistribution at this stage would require republication of the RFP. The current distribution is standard for QCBS-based government IT tenders and ensures no single evaluation parameter is disproportionately weighted. The scoring criteria and qualifying thresholds remain as published. Live demo qualifying threshold may consider as 75%.
K11	BDA (Expert Review)	Pg 69 General Liability	Suggestion: Increase total liability cap from 10% to 25% of project value, and 100% for critical breaches.	Not accepted. A liability cap of 10% of total project value is standard in government IT contracts and provides adequate protection alongside the Performance Security (5%) and other contractual remedies (termination, penalty clauses, EMD forfeiture). Increasing to 25% would discourage participation and inflate pricing as bidders factor in higher risk. The clause remains as published.
K12	BDA (Expert Review)	General	Observation: SLAs not mentioned in detail; project timelines and milestones not mentioned; 90 days agreement period is insufficient for go-live; is it customisation of existing product or new development?	(a) SLAs: Addressed in Section 6.9 (Warranty) and Section 6.4.4 (SLA & Penalty Framework). Detailed SLA matrix to be mutually agreed in Contract. (b) Timelines: Project milestones and implementation plan are deliverables under Section 6.10 (Sl. 1–2: SRS and UI/UX Design during Design Phase). Bidders shall propose realistic milestones in their technical proposal. (c) 90-day term: Acknowledged as template error (see K3 above). Agreement term to be corrected. (d) Customisation vs New: Both approaches are acceptable. The Service Provider may propose a new DMS developed from scratch, or an existing COTS/open-source product suitably customised and configured to meet BDA's requirements. Evaluation will be based on functional compliance, usability, and demonstrated capability during PoC (Section 3.3, Component 5).

Receipt No. 487122/2026/O/O THE EDP CELL (Computer No. 487122)

Generated from eOffice by DR. H R SHANTHARAJANNA, BDA-EM(HRS), ENGINEER MEMBER, BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY on 10/04/2026 06:23 PM

SUMMARY OF KEY DECISIONS

1. All eligibility criteria and technical qualification criteria as published in the RFP shall remain unchanged, except for the relaxation of Clause 1.5, Sl. No. 9 regarding the requirement of 25 IT professionals based in Karnataka.

2. The requirement of 25 Karnataka-based IT professionals is relaxed. However, the Service Provider shall unconditionally ensure that whenever BDA requires the physical presence of personnel at BDA premises, such personnel shall be made available within 24 hours at the Service Provider's cost. The mandatory deputation of 2 full-time software professionals at BDA premises per Clause 1.6(iii) remains unchanged.

3. The Financial Proposal shall be an all-inclusive lump-sum project cost certified by the bidder's Statutory Auditor/CA.

4. BDA shall arrange and bear the cost of all third-party API contracts and gateway subscriptions. The Service Provider shall bear all technical integration costs.

5. BDA shall provide the official domain name and production SSL certificate. Deployment on Government SDC or BDA-specified infrastructure.

6. All training physically at BDA premises. Minimum two rounds: UAT and pre-go-live.

7. VAPT mandatory (CERT-In empanelled, SP's cost). STQC conditional.

8. All software licenses perpetual, transferred to BDA. Open-source encouraged.

9. The draft Service Contract contains acknowledged template errors (Grievance Portal reference, Rs. 1.5L performance security, 90-day term, Java/MySQL restriction) which shall be corrected at the time of contract execution. The RFP (Sections 1–6) prevails over the draft Service Contract.

10. The technical evaluation scoring matrix and qualifying thresholds (overall ≥ 75 and Live Demo ≥ 75%).

11. The liability cap of 10% of project value and the restriction on consortium/subcontracting remain as published.

12. Multi-tenancy means shared platform usage under BDA's control; source code is not distributed to other tenants.

13. The General Conditions of Contract, Force Majeure, Termination, Dispute Settlement and all contractual clauses shall remain as published.

14. These pre-bid meeting proceedings and the clarifications contained herein shall form an integral part of the RFP and the resultant Contract.

15. Bidders are requested to note the clarifications provided herein and prepare their proposals accordingly.

Smt. Nandini. P M,
EDP Cell Head, SLAO-6, DSKL, BDA

Sri. Niranjan K M
Executive Engineer, HPD-1, BDA

Executive Engineer,
Housing Project Division-1,
Bangalore Development Authority.

ಮುಖ್ಯಸ್ಥರು
ಇಡಿಪಿ ಶಾಖೆ

Dr. A Lokesha
Finance Member, BDA

Finance Member
Bangalore Development Authority
Bengaluru

Dr. Shantharajanna H R
Engineering Member, BDA

SS

Receipt No. 487122/2026/O/O THE EDP CELL (Computer No. 487122)

Generated from eOffice by DR. H R SHANTHARAJANNA, BDA-EM(HRS), ENGINEER MEMBER, BANGALORE DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY on 10/04/2026 06:23 PM